UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.         | FILING DATE                          | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/787,429              | 02/26/2004                           | Joseph D. Rippolone  | 67067-012           | 4762             |
|                         | 7590 08/14/200<br>ASKEY & OLDS, P.C. | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |
| 400 WEST MA             |                                      | GILBERT, WILLIAM V   |                     |                  |
| SUITE 350<br>BIRMINGHAN | л, MI 48009                          |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                         | •                                    |                      | 3635                |                  |
|                         |                                      |                      |                     |                  |
|                         |                                      |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                         |                                      |                      | 08/14/2008          | PAPER            |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)         |  |  |
|-----------------|----------------------|--|--|
| 10/787,429      | RIPPOLONE, JOSEPH D. |  |  |
|                 |                      |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit             |  |  |

|   | William V. Gilbert  | 3635  |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the o   | correspondence add  | ress                                     |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>31 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL  | ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL   | LOWANCE.  |  |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:   | the same day as filing a Notice of a<br>replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi<br>eal (with appeal fee) in compliance          | Appeal. To avoid abar<br>t, or other evidence, w<br>with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request            |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date   | of the final rejection.   |   |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)  | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing<br>b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE<br>f).   | g date of the final rejection<br>FIRST REPLY WAS FII                      | n.<br>LED WITHIN TWO                     |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount<br>hortened statutory period for reply origi<br>than three months after the mailing dat | of the fee. The appropria<br>nally set in the final Offic                 | ate extension fee<br>e action; or (2) as |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp<br/>filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter<br/>Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wind<br/>AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>  | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of the  |  |
| <del></del>   | out prior to the data of filing a brief   | will not be entered be  | 001100                                   |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor  | nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);   | ΓE below);  |  |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beti<br>appeal; and/or  | ter form for appeal by materially rec   | ducing or simplifying ti  | ne issues for                            |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c<br>NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  | corresponding number of finally reje  | ected claims.   |  |
| <ul> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>   |   | mpliant Amendment (l  | PTOL-324).                               |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>   | ·   | •   | _  |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:   |   | I be entered and an e   | xplanation of                            |
| Claim(s) objected to:<br>Claim(s) rejected:   |   |   |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |   |   |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   |   |   |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>   | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea<br>and was not earlier presented. Se  | al and/or appellant fail<br>ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1                          | s to provide a<br>).                     |
| 10.   | n of the status of the claims after er  | ntry is below or attach   | ed.                                      |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but<br/>See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>   |   | condition for allowan   | ce because:                              |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (<br>13. ☐ Other:  | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)  |   |  |
|   | /Basil Katcheves/<br>Examiner, Art Unit 3635  |   |  |
|   |   |   |  |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: regarding the limitation of the gutter wall, the examiner noted in the rejection of claim 12 that the gutter walls were defined as Bortugno: 16 and 23. The applicant should respectfully note that the examiner is allowed to use the broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification and concluded that portion 23 is a wall of the gutter as aplicant provided no additional structural limitations to define a gutter wall. Portion 23 also has a continuous cross section, in that "continuous cross section" may be interpreted in numerous ways: one is that the member extend the entire desired length, another is that it be continuous only a portion of the length. The limitation "continuous cross section" is open to numerous interpretations and the examiner concludes that the wall has a continuous cross section in that it extends for a desired length, or it has a continuous cross section for only a portion of the length between members 29.

Regarding the rejection of claims 7 and 8, the examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's analysis. The examiner concludes and maintains that the Bernardi reference does teach an input and return connector. See column 2, lines 30-40 in that this system can be hot water, steam or air which is supplied. These systems are well known for having inputs and returns and Figure 2 of Bernardi shows how the system is cyclic, which means it has an input and return. Regarding the statement that Bortugno teaches against the combination of the references used, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Both systems are used for the removal of snow or ice from a structure, and the Bernardi reference was used only for the teaching of an input and return system.

Regarding the use of linear and nonlinear portions, the examiner maintains the reasoning that it is not a patentable feature in that applicant has provided no evidence as to why the non-linear portion would be patentably significant. Regarding the rejection using duplication of parts, the examiner argues that no reasoning for the modification is necessary because the Harza case states that it is not a patentably significant feature since no new or unexpected results are produced.